



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 18, 2005

Ms. Pamela Smith
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P. O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2005-03304

Dear Ms. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 222418.

The Department of Public Safety (the "DPS") received a request for all documents relating to contracts between the DPS and a particular company. You claim that some of the requested information, which you have submitted for our review, may implicate the proprietary interests of Business Ink, Company ("Business Ink").¹ You inform us that you notified Business Ink of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Business Ink and have reviewed their arguments and the submitted information.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from

¹We note that the requestor specifies that he is seeking information related to contracts with "SmartMail," not "Business Ink." A governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request for information to any responsive information that is within its custody or control. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). We assume that the DPS has made the required good-faith effort to relate this request to responsive information that is within the DPS' possession or control.

a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party’s claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). The private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations,

²The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company’s] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of the company's arguments and the submitted information, we find that Business Ink has demonstrated that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. We have marked this information that must be withheld by DPS in accordance with section 552.110. However, we find that Business Ink has not demonstrated that any of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure as either trade secret information under section 552.110(a) or commercial or financial information the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor). Accordingly, only the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Robert B. Rapfogel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RBR/krl

Ref: ID# 222418

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Chris Mahon
Texas Observer
307 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)